arXiv:1704.03715v1 [math.CO] 12 Apr 2017

Tight embedding of modular lattices into partition lattices: progress and program

Marcel Wild

1 Introduction

About twenty five years ago I made some strides towards finding necessary respectively sufficient conditions for a finite[1] modular lattice L to be tightly embeddable (i.e. as economic as it gets) into a partition lattice Part(n). Here Part(n) is the lattice of all (set) partitions of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. That L is embeddable *at all* into some Part(n) (although n being super-exponential in $|L|$) was established in a celebrated Theorem of Pudlak-Tuma from 1980. It is easy to see that each finite distributive lattice is tightly embeddable. As to modular (non-distributive) lattices, one example L_0 together with its tight embedding into Part(5) is given in Figure 1(a). For instance, 13, 25, 4 is shorthand for the partition $\{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 5\}, \{4\}\}$. The two elements larger lattice L_1 in Figure 1(b) does not admit a tight embedding into Part(5). Generally the necessary conditions for tight embeddability into Part(n) turned out [W3] to be quite close to the sufficient ones. To close the gap roughly speaking half of the remaining work is lattice-theoretic, but the other half is purely combinatorial and the topic of this article.

Namely, Section 2 reviews the definition of a partial linear space and familiar concepts such as connected components and cycles. Further concepts, apparently first introduced in [W3], are reviewed and partly trimmed. Section 3 couples matroids and graphs to partial linear spaces. Apart from applications later on, this may well be of wider matroid-theoretic interest. How the material up to Section 3 relates to modular lattices slowly becomes apparent in Section 4, and more so Section 5. Section 6 proposes open problems for combinatorists and 'modular latticians'. As a perk, throughout the article many results of [W3] will be presented in somewhat crisper ways.

2 Partial linear spaces on their own

A *partial linear space (PLS)* (J, Λ) consists of a finite set J of points and a set Λ of 3-element[2] subsets $l \subseteq \Lambda$ called *lines* such that

(1) $|l \cap l'| \leq 1$ for all distinct $l,\ l' \in \Lambda$.

[1] Without further mention, all structures considered in this paper will be finite. Note that the present article is an expansion of [W4].

[2] Usually also lines of cardinality > 3 are considered, but for us only cardinality 3 matters.



Fig.1 (a)



Fig. 1 (b)



Fig. 2

(J_1, Λ_1)

Fig. 3





We first introduce paths and cycles in a PLS in unsurprising ways. Lesser known will be these concepts from [W3]: Relative and absolute midpoints of lines, point-splittings, and the rank of a PLS.

2.1 Because of (1) any distinct points $p,\ q$ of a PLS (J,Λ) lie on at most one common line which we then denote by $[p,q]$. For $n \geq 2$ a tuplet $P = (p_1, p_2, .., p_n)$ is called a *path* if all lines $[p_i, p_{i+1}]$ $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ exist and $[P] := [p_1, p_2] \cup \cdots \cup [p_{n-1}, p_n]$ has cardinality $2n-1$. Two points p, q are *connected* if $p = q$ or there is a path $(p, ..., q)$. This yields an equivalence relation whose $c(J,\Lambda)$ many classes are the *connected components* of (J,Λ). A *cycle* C is a path $(p_1, p_2, .., p_n)$ such that line $[p_n, p_1]$ exists and such that $[C] := [p_1, p_2] \cup \cdots \cup [p_{n-1}, p_n] \cap [p_n, p_1]$ has cardinality $2n$. For instance the PLS in Figure 2 has the path $(1, 2, 3, 4)$. Yet albeit line $[4, 1]$ exists, it is *no* cycle because$[1, 2] \cup \cdots \cup [4, 1]$ has cardinality $7 \neq 2n = 8$.

Necessarily each cycle $C = (p_1, p_2, .., p_n)$ has $n \geq 3$ and we call the points p_i the *C-junctions*. For each *C-line*, i.e. $l = [p_i, p_{i+1}]$ (where $n+1 = 1$) the unique point in $l \setminus \{p_i, p_{i+1}\}$ is called the *C-midpoint* of ℓ. For instance, consider (J_1, Λ_1) depicted on the top left of Figure 3. It features the cycle $C = (1, 3, 5, 7)$. The C-midpoints of $[1, 3],\ [3, 5],\ [5, 7],\ [7, 1]$ are $2,\ 4,\ 6,\ 8$ respectively and they 'physically' appear in the middle of the drawn lines. This is appealing but cannot always be achieved simultaneously for all cycles. For instance $C' = (2, 3, 5)$ is a cycle of (J_1, Λ_1) whose line $[2, 3]$ has the C'-midpoint 1.

2.2 We say that a PLS (J,Λ) is a *pierced graph (PG)*, in brief (J,Λ) is a PG, if each $l \in \Lambda$ contains at least one point which is only incident with ℓ. For instance, starting with any[3] graph G and 'piercing' one new point on each edge obviously yields a PG $(J, \Lambda(G))$, see Figure 4. Conversely, let (J,Λ) be any PG. Fix any $\ell = \{p, q, r\}$ in Λ and let q only be incident with ℓ. If (J_0, Λ_0) is defined by $J_0 := J \setminus \{q\}$ and $\Lambda_0 := \Lambda \setminus \{\ell\}$ then clearly (J_0, Λ_0) remains PG. By induction $(J_0, \Lambda_0) = (J_0, \Lambda(G_0))$ for some graph G_0. If G arises from G_0 by addition of the edge $\{p, r\}$ then $(J,\Lambda) = (J, \Lambda(G))$ by the isolation property of q.

2.3 We say the PLS (J,Λ) has *unique midpoints* (in brief: (J,Λ) *is* a UMP) if for any two cycles $C,\ C'$ and each $\ell \in \Lambda$ that simultaneously is a C-line and a C'-line, the C-midpoint coincides with the C'-midpoint. For instance (J_1, Λ_1) in Figure 3 is not a UMP.

Each PG clearly is a UMP. To establish a kind of converse in Lemma 1 we need a few preliminaries. For positive integers t we will use the shorthand $[t] := \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$. Let (J^1, Λ^1) to (J^t, Λ^t) be PLSes such that $J^2 \cap J^1 = \{p_2\},\ J^3 \cap (J^1 \cup J^2) = \{p_3\}$, and so on until $J^t \cap (J^1 \cup \cdots \cup J^{t-1}) = \{p_t\}$. Here the points p_i need not be distinct. Putting $J := \bigcup J^i$ and $\Lambda := \bigcup \Lambda^i$ it is clear that (J,Λ) is again a PLS. We call it a *tree* of the PLSes (J^i, Λ^i). Using induction on i one sees that each cycle C of (J,Λ) must be such that for some fixed element $i \in [t]$ all C-lines are contained in Λ^i. In particular it follows that each tree of pierced graphs has unique midpoints. The converse holds[4] as well:

[3] All graphs appearing in this paper are assumed to be simple, i.e without multiple edges and loops.

[4] Up to terminology this is shown in [W3, Lemma 13]: PG is called mpi and UMP is called regular. More general (but clumsy) 'quasiregular' PLSes are also persued in [W3]. With hindsight they turned out to be a dead end. The research directions pointed out in the present article likely are more fruitful.



Fig. 4



Fig. 5



(J_3, Λ_3)

Fig. 6

Lemma 1: If (J,Λ) is a UMP then each connected component of (J,Λ) is a tree of PGes.

2.4 We call a PLS (J,Λ) *nondrowning constructible (ndc)* if there is a 'non-drowning' ordering $(\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t)$ of Λ, i.e. such that $\ell_{i+1} \not\subseteq \ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i$ for all $1 \leq i < t$. Obviously PG implies ndc; *any* ordering of Λ will do. In view of Lemma 1 more generally UMP implies ndc. Although (J_1,Λ_1) in Figure 3 is not UMP, it is ndc since

$$\ell_1 = \{1,2,3\},\ \ell_2 = \{3,4,5\},\ \ell_3 = \{5,6,7\},\ \ell_4 = \{7,8,1\},\ \ell_5 = \{2,9,5\}$$

is a non-drowning[5] ordering of Λ_1. In contrast, one checks that the *Fano-plane* (J_2,Λ_2) in Figure 5 is not ndc.

2.5 We refer to [W3, p.216] for the formal definition of a *point splitting* of a PLS. For us an intuitive understanding suffices. Thus the splitting of point 2 of (J_1,Λ_1) yields the PLS on the right to it in Figure 3. Generally speaking each point-splitting increases the number of points by one but keeps the same number of lines. One can show [W3, Lemma 11] that the number $ps(J,\Lambda)$ of point-splittings required to turn (J,Λ) into an *acyclic* PLS (i.e. without cycles) with the same number $c(J,\Lambda)$ of connected components is independent of the actual point-splittings performed. This is illustrated in Figure 3 where $ps(J_1,\Lambda_1) = 2$.

Define[6] the *rank* (more precisely: PLS-rank) of (J,Λ) as

$$rk(J,\Lambda) := |\Lambda| - ps(J,\Lambda) + c(J,\Lambda). \tag{2}$$

The motivation for definition (2) will become evident later. For instance from $ps(J_1,\Lambda_1) = 2$, follows $rk(J_1,\Lambda_1) = 5-2+1 = 4$. Similarly one checks that the Fano-plane in Figure 5 has

$$rk(J_2,\Lambda_2) = 7-8+1 = 0. \tag{3}$$

Let (J_1',Λ_1') to (J_c',Λ_c') be the connected components of (J',Λ'). Because of

$$rk(J',\Lambda') = \sum_{i=1}^{c} |\Lambda_i'| \ - \ \sum_{i=1}^{c} ps(J_i',\Lambda_i') \ + \ c \ = \ \sum_{i=1}^{c} (|\Lambda_i'| - ps(J_i',\Lambda_i') + 1) \ = \sum_{i=1}^{c} rk(J_i',\Lambda_i') \tag{4}$$

we can usually restrict ourselves to connected PLSes (J,Λ). Then Λ (if nonempty) can be ordered in such a way $(\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t)$ that $(\ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i) \cap \ell_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < t$. Upon adding ℓ_{i+1} the rank rk of the PLS so far by (2) changes in one of three ways:

(5+) If $|(\ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i) \cap \ell_{i+1}| = 1$ then rk increases to $rk + (1-0+0) = rk+1$.

(5) If $|(\ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i) \cap \ell_{i+1}| = 2$ then rk remains $rk + (1-1+0) = rk$.

(5-) If $|(\ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i) \cap \ell_{i+1}| = 3$ then rk *decreases* to $rk + (1-2+0) = rk-1$.

We now see that the terminology 'nondrowning' constructible in 2.4 amounts to 'non-decreasing' constructible in the sense that the sequence $(\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_t)$ can be chosen as non-drowning iff it can

[5]The fact that also drowning orderings exist, such as $(\ell_2,\ell_3,\ell_4,\ell_5,\ell_1)$, is irrelevant.

[6]This definition slightly differs from the one in [W3,p.216] where the rank was defined as $|\Lambda| - ps(J,\Lambda)$.

be chosen to avoid the rank-decreasing case (5-).

2.6 Later on (Section 5) we look at PLSes (J, Λ) whose universe J happens to be the set $J = J(L)$ of join-irreducibles of a lattice L. In this case we say the PLS (J, Λ) is *L-born*. For instance we will match the points of J_1 with the 9 join-irreducibles of L_1. Unsurprisingly, L-born PLSes give rise to various new concepts. Novel features also arise when *matroids* enter the scene, and that happens first:

3 Entering matroids and graphs

Let $M = M(E)$ be any simple matroid with universe E and let (J, Λ) be a PLS. Then a bijection $\psi : J \to E$ is called a *weak (J, Λ)-matroid* if

(6) $\psi(\ell)$ is dependent in M for all $\ell \in \Lambda$.

3.1 If M is binary (the most relevant case for us) then we speak of weak binary (J, Λ)-matroids . For instance Figure 5 features a weak binary (J_2, Λ_2)-matroid in obvious ways. (To unclutter notation often the explicite mention of ψ will be omitted.) In contrast we claim that there is no weak binary (J_3, Λ_3)-matroid $\psi : J_3 \to E$ (see Figure 6). By way of contradiction, suppose such a ψ exists. Without loss of generality the two horizontal lines are labelled as in Figure 6 (with a, a', b, b' in some suitable vector space $GF(2)^n$). Then the application of (6) to the three vertical lines forces the vectors labelling the bottom line. Applying (6) to the diagonal line yields $b' = (a + a') + (a + b) = a' + b$, and so $a + a' + b + b' = a + b' + b' = a$ which contradicts the injectivity of ψ.

In the sequel we often focus on particular binary matroids $M(E)$, i.e. *graphic* matroids whose universe E by definition is the edge set of a graph $G = (V, E)$ with vertex set V. The dependency relation on E is the standard one. In a weak graphic (J, Λ)-matroids condition (6) demands that each line ℓ maps to a triangle of G. We emphasize that pierced graphs (J, Λ) have nothing to do with the types of graphs G just introduced.

3.2 For any weak (J, Λ)-matroid we may compare the PLS-rank $rk(J, \Lambda)$ with the *matroid-rank* $mrk(E)$. For instance the binary (J_2, Λ_2)-matroid in Figure 5 (with $E = GF(2)^3$) has $rk(J_2, \Lambda_2) = 0 < 3 = mrk(E)$. The converse inequality can be be guaranteed in this scenario:

(7) If (J, Λ) is ndc and has a weak graphic (J, Λ)-matroid then $mrk(E) \leq rk(J, \Lambda)$.

Proof of (7). Let $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_t)$ be a non-drowning listing of Λ. If $\Lambda' = \{\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_i\}$ and $E' \subseteq E$ is the subset matching $J' := \ell_1 \cup \ldots \cup \ell_i$ then $mrk(E') \leq rk(J', \Lambda')$ by induction. Upon adding ℓ_{i+1} only cases (5+) or (5) occur by the ndc assumption. In case (5+) the PLS-rank increases by 1 while the matroid-rank increases by 1 *or* 0 (depending on whether or not the new edge features a new vertex). In case (5) both ranks remain the same. Thus the inequality gets perpetuated. QED



(J^1, Λ^1)



(J^2, Λ^2)

$\Rightarrow$



(J_4, Λ_4)

$G_1 = (V_1, E^1)$



$G_2 = (V_2, E^2)$



$G_4 = (V_4, E_4)$

Fig. 7



(J_4, Λ_4)

$\Rightarrow$



G

Figure 8



(J_5, Λ_5)

Fig. 9



3.3 Let $M(E)$ be a matroid. A weak (J,Λ)-matroid $J \to E$ which satisfies

(8) $\quad rk(J,\Lambda) = mrk(E)$ *(rank-consistency of the first kind)*

will henceforth be called a (non-weak) (J,Λ)-*matroid*. For instance, letting $n \geq 4$ and letting a,b,c,d be any independent vectors of $GF(2)^n$ the bottom left in Fig.3 defines a binary (J_1,Λ_1)-matroid. In view of (3) it is clear that there is no binary (J_2,Λ_2)-matroid.

Problem 1: What are necessary or sufficient conditions for a PLS (J,Λ) to allow a binary (or graphic) (J,Λ)-matroid? Ditto for weak (J,Λ)-matroids?

3.4 If (J^1,Λ^1) is a connected PG with *endpoints* (=non-midpoints of lines) $p_1,\ldots,p_n$ then put $V^1 = \{0,1,\ldots,n\}$ and define $G^1 = (V^1,E^1)$ as follows [W3,p.218]. A graphic (J^1,Λ^1)-matroid ψ is obtained as follows. Each endpoint p_i is mapped (by ψ) to the edge $\{0,i\}$, and if the line $[p_i,p_j]$ exists then its midpoint q is mapped to $\{i,j\}$. In this way (6) is satisfied. This is illustrated in Figure 7 for concrete PGes (J^i,Λ^i) and coupled graphs G^i $(i=1,2)$. One has $rk(J^1,\Lambda^1) = 3-1+1 = |V^1|-1 = mrk(E^1)$ and $rk(J^2,\Lambda^2) = 3 = mrk(E^2)$. Thus also (8) is fulfilled. Consequently each G^i yields what we call a *standard* graphic (J^i,Λ^i)-matroid $(i=1,2)$. Likewise 'standard' is defined for any PG.

3.4.1 Generally a tree (J,Λ) of PLSes (J^i,Λ^i) having graphic (J^i,Λ^i)-matroids inherits itself a natural graphic (J,Λ)-matroid [W3, Lemma 12]. We merely illustrate this for the PGes in Figure 7. Merging q of (J_1,Λ_1) with p_1' of (J_2,Λ_2) yields the UMP on the top right in Figure 7. Continuing our indexing scheme let's denote this UMP as (J_4,Λ_4). It follows that

$$(9)\quad \begin{aligned} rk(J,\Lambda) &= |\Lambda| - ps(J,\Lambda) + 1 = |\Lambda^1| + |\Lambda^2| - ps(J^1,\Lambda^1) - ps(J^2,\Lambda^2) + 1 \\ &\overset{(2)}{=} rk(J^1,\Lambda^1) + rk(J^2,\Lambda^2) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

If corresponding to the merging of q and p_1' we merge the edges $\psi(q)$ of G_1 and $\psi(p_1')$ of G_2 (i.e. the boldface edges in Figure 7) then we get a graph $G = (V,E)$ which indeed obeys rank-consistency:

$$(10)\quad \begin{aligned} mrk(E) &= |V| - 1 = |V_1| + |V_2| - 2 - 1 = mrk(E^1) + mrk(E^2) - 1 \\ &= rk(J^1,\Lambda^1) + rk(J^2,\Lambda^2) \overset{(9)}{=} rk(J,\Lambda) \end{aligned}$$

In view of Lemma 1 we have thus sketched a proof of [W3, Lemma 14(a)] which we restate as follows.

Lemma 2: Each UMP (J,Λ) admits a graphic (J,Λ)-matroid.

Having grasped how the graph G of a UMP arises, it will henceforth be more convenient to *label the edges* rather than the vertices of G. In this way we can use the *same labels* as for the points of the UMP. Thus Figure 7 gives way to Figure 8.

3.5 In Figure 9(a) we blow up (J_4,Λ_4) of Fig. 8(a) to (J_5,Λ_5) with $J_5 = J_4 \cup \{11\}$, $\Lambda_5 = \Lambda_4 \cup \{\{5,10,11\}\}$. Unfortunately the graphic (J_4,Λ_4)-matroid in Fig. 8(b) doesn't adapt accordingly

since the edges 5 and 10 cannot be completed to a triangle $\{5, 10, 11\}$. However Figure 9(b) proves that (J_5, Λ_5) *has* a graphic (J_5, Λ_5)-matroid provided by *another* graph $G' = (V', E')$; one checks that indeed all lines map to triangles and that $rk(J_5, \Lambda_5) = 6-2+1 = |V'|-1 = mrk(E')$.

At first sight (J_1, Λ_1) in Figure 3 doesn't look more complicated than (J_5, Λ_5) yet it doesn't even have a *weak* graphic (J_1, Λ_1)-matroid, as we shall see. In the remainder of Section 3 we derive a necessary condition (Theorem 4) for a PLS (J, Λ) to have a weak graphic (J, Λ)-matroid which is 'neat' in a sense to be explained. Its basic idea is due to Manoel Lemos, but a few precautions were in order. Corollary 5 tackles proper (=nonweak) graphic (J, Λ)-matroids.

3.6 In this and the next Subsection we consider cycles $C = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ on their *own*, i.e. not embedded in a larger PLS. More precisely we consider PLSes of type $([C], \Lambda^*)$ with $\Lambda^* = \{[p_i, p_{i+1}] : \ 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. Apart from the C-junctions p_i we have the C-midpoints $q_i \in [p_i, p_{i+1}]$. See Figure 10(a) where $n = 6$. For any cycle C let us look at its standard graphic $([C], \Lambda^*)$-matroid, provided by a wheel W as in Figure 10(b). Thus these transformations occur:

junctions of C $\rightarrow$ *spokes of* W
midpoints of C $\rightarrow$ *rims of* W

Since cycles are ndc it follows from (7) that necessarily

(11) $mrk(E) \leq rk(C, \Lambda^*)$ for each weak graphic $([C], \Lambda^*)$-matroid $[C] \rightarrow E$.

3.7 That $<$ can take place in (11) is witnessed by the cycle C_0 in Figure 11, which has a weak graphic $([C_0], \Lambda_0^*)$-matroid $[C_0] \rightarrow E_0$ provided by a *non-wheel* graph (V_0, E_0). Indeed one checks that $mrk(E_0) = 4 < 5 = rk(C_0, \Lambda_0^*)$. The good news is, when rank-consistency is postulated (i.e. 'weak' is dropped), we get what we want:

Lemma 3: If C is a cycle for which graph $G = (V, E)$ provides a graphic $([C], \Lambda^*)$-matroid $\psi : [C] \rightarrow E$ then G must be a wheel.

Proof. Suppose $C = \{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$. Putting $r' = \psi(r)$ for each $r \in [C]$, it suffices to show that $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\}$ is of type

(12) $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\} = star(v)$,

i.e. all edges incident with some vertex v of G. Indeed, since each $\{p_i, q_i, p_{i+1}\} \in \Lambda^*$ yields a triangle $\{p'_i, q'_i, p'_{i+1}\}$ of G, it will follow from (12) that G is a wheel W, thus proving Lemma 3.

(13) If (12) fails then the edge set $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\}$ contains the edge set of a circuit of G.

For the moment we accept (13), and by way of contradiction assume that (12) fails. On the one hand $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\}$ spans the universe E of the graphic matroid since each q'_i is in a circuit $\{p'_i, q'_i, p'_{i+1}\}$. On the other hand $\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\}$ contains a circuit by (13). Hence $mrk(E) = mrk(\{p'_1, \ldots, p'_n\}) \leq n - 1$. Yet $rk(C, \Lambda^*) = |\Lambda^*| - ps(C, \Lambda^*) + 1 = n - 1 + 1 = n$, and so $rk(C, \Lambda^*) \neq mrk(E)$. This contradicts the rank-consistency of ψ, and thus proves (12).



(a)

Figure 10



(b)



Figure 11





Figure 12

Proof of (13). Because for each line $\{p_i, q_i, p_{i+1}\}$ the edge set $\{p'_i, q'_i, p'_{i+1}\}$is a triangle of G, each edge p'_{i+1} is incident with edge p'_i (modulo n). Say p'_2 is incident with $p'_1 = \{v_1, v_2\}$ in v_2. Since (12) fails there is $i \geq 2$ such that p'_i is incident with v_2 but p'_{i+1} is not, see Figure 12. If p'_{i+1} is incident with v_1 then $\{p'_1, p'_i, p'_{i+1}\}$ is a triangle (whence circuit) of G. Otherwise consider p'_{i+2}. As shown in Figure 12 there are two options for p'_{i+2}. Whichever option takes place, if p'_{i+2} is incident with p'_1 then we get again a circuit of G, if not continue with p'_{i+3}, and so on. Because at the latest p'_n is incident with p'_1, there must be a cycle in G. This proves (13). QED

3.7.1 Figure 11 shows that the rank-consistency in Lemma 3 cannot be dropped. However, it *can* be dropped for small cycles:

(14) Let the cycle $([C], \Lambda^*)$ be *small* in the sense that $|\Lambda^*| \in \{3, 4\}$. If $G = (V, E)$ provides a weak $([C], \Lambda^*)$-matroid $[C] \to E$ then G must be a wheel.

Proof of (14). Suppose first (case 1) that strict inequality $<$ takes place in (11). Then $|V| - 1 = mrk(E) < rk([C], \Lambda^*) = |\Lambda^*|$. If $|\Lambda^*| = 3$ then $|V| \leq 3$, whence $|E| \leq \binom{3}{2} < 6 = |[C]|$. If $|\Lambda^*| = 4$ then $|V| \leq 4$, whence $|E| \leq \binom{4}{2} < 8 = |[C]|$. In both subcases this contradicts[7] the bijectivity of $[C] \to E$. Now suppose (case 2) that equality takes place in (11). Then the claim follows from Lemma 3. QED

3.8 Unfortunately, Lemma 3 only applies to *isolated* cycles and not to comprising PLSes. Specifically, we claim that (J_6, Λ_6) in Figure 13 is rank-consistently represented[8] by G_6, but *contains* a cycle C of rank *higher* than $rk(J_6, \Lambda_6)$ that induces a non-wheel in G_6! Indeed, one checks that lines map to triangles and that $rk(J_6, \Lambda_6) = 8 - 4 + 1 = |V_6| - 1 = mrk(E_6)$. The cycle $C = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ of (J_6, Λ_6) maps to edges in G_6 that are not the spokes of a wheel. The PLS-rank of $([C], \Lambda^*)$ is 6, thus higher than the rank of its host (J_6, Λ_6). It is noteworthy that (J_6, Λ_6) is benign enough to be ndc; a non-drowning line sequence is

$$\{3, g, d\},\ \{3, c, 4\},\ \{4, d, 5\},\ \{5, e, 6\},\ \{e, g, 2\},\ \{2, 3, b\},\ \{2, a, 1\},\ \{1, 6, f\}$$

3.8.1 Let (J, Λ) be a PLS containing a cycle $C = (p_1, \ldots, p_n)$ with junctions p_i and C-midpoints $q_i \in [p_i, p_{i+1}]$. As will be seen, a path between two junctions p_i and p_j is 'benign'. In contrast, a combination $q_i,\ q_j$ or $q_i,\ p_j$ poses problems. Specifically, a *pure midpoint-link* (with respect to C) is a path $P = (q_i, \ldots, q_j)$ with $[P] \cap [C] = \{q_i, q_j\}$, and a *mixed midpoint-link* is a path $P' = (q_i, \ldots, p_j)$ with $[P'] \cap [C] = \{q_i, p_j\}$. For instance the cycle $(1, 3, 5, 7)$ of (J_1, Λ_1) in Figure 3 has the mixed midpoint-link $(2, 5)$. We say that C *loves short midpoint-links* if $q_j = q_{i+1}$ in each pure midpoint-link and $p_j \in \{p_i, p_{i+1}\}$ in each mixed midpoint-link. The PLS (J, Λ) as a whole is said to *love short midpoint-links* if all its cycles love short midpoint-links. Neither (J_1, Λ_1) nor(J_6, Λ_6) loves short midpoint-links. In contrast, (J_5, Λ_5) of Figure 9 loves them.

[7]The cardinality argument breaks down when $|\Lambda^*| = 5$ since then $|E| \leq \binom{5}{2} = 10 = |[C]|$. That indeed things can go wrong, is witnessed by Figure 11.

[8]That is just a manner of speech for: Putting $G_6 = (V_6, E_6)$ there is a graphic (J_6, Λ_6)-matroid $J_6 \to E_6$.



(J_6, Λ_6)

Fig. 13



$G_6 = (V_6, E_6)$



(a)

Fig. 14



(b)



(a)

Fig.15



(b)



$\Rightarrow$

Fig.16



$L_3 =$



Fig.17 (a)



$\varphi_1(J)$

(b)



$\varphi_2(J)$

(c)

3.8.2 A *wheely* (J,Λ)-matroid is the special type of graphic (J,Λ)-matroid where each cycle of (J,Λ) maps to a wheel of the coupled graph (thus junctions to spokes, midpoints to rims). The concept 'wheely' clearly extends to weak (J,Λ)-matroids. For instance the weak graphic (J_6,Λ_6)-matroid in Figure 13 is *not* wheely.

Theorem 4: If (J,Λ) has a weak wheely (J,Λ)-matroid, then (J,Λ) loves short midpoint-links.

Proof. For some graph $G=(V,E))$ let $\psi : J \to E$ be the postulated wheely (J,Λ)-matroid. Consider say a cycle $C=(a_1,\ldots,a_6)$ of (J,Λ), see Fig. 14(a). By assumption it is mapped on the subwheel of G in Figure 14(b).

By way of contradiction assume C had a long *pure* (case 1) midpoint-link, such as (b_2,b,b_5) in Figure 15(a). As illustrated in Fig. 15(b) this yields a cycle C' in (J,Λ) with junctions (among others) b_2 and b_5. By assumption C' maps to a subwheel of G, in such a way that $b_2,\ b_5$ (being spokes) are mapped to adjacent edges. This contradicts Figure 14(b) where $b_2,\ b_5$ are not adjacent.

Similarly, by way of contradiction assume C had a long *mixed* (case 2) midpoint-link, such as (b_2,a_4) in Figure 16(a). This yields a cycle C'' in (J,Λ) with junctions $a_4,\ b_2$. Akin to before they are mapped to adjacent edges of G, which contradicts Figure 14(b). (Generally a_i is incident with edge b_j only when $j\in\{i-1,i\}$.) QED

Corollary 5: If all cycles of (J,Λ) are small, and if (J,Λ) doesn't love short midpoint-links, then (J,Λ) doesn't admit a graphic (J,Λ)-matroid.

Proof. By the smallness of cycles and by (14) each graphic (J,Λ)-matroid is wheely. The claim thus follows from Theorem 4. QED

It e.g. follows that (J_1,Λ_1) in Figure 3 has no graphic (J_1,Λ_1)-matroid. The PLS (J_1,Λ_1) will pop up again.

4 Entering modular lattices. Part 1: Tight embeddings into geometric lattices

A homomorphism $f : L \to L'$ between modular lattices is *tight* if it is height-preserving in the sense that $d(f(a))=d(a)$ for all $a\in L$. Here $d(a)$ is the height of a, and we write $d(L):=d(\top)$ where $\top$ is L's unit element. It is well known that each tight homomorphism is injective. We first (4.1) define 'k-linear representations' of modular lattices with respect to a field k. Both tight k-linear representations and tight embeddings into partition lattices (cf. Introduction) fit the common hat (4.2) of tight embeddings into flat lattices $L(K,\tilde{})$ of matroids $(K,\tilde{})$.The word 'matroid' gives a first hint of why we introduced (J,Λ)-matroids in Section 3. However the relevance of PLSes (J,Λ) themselves will remain enigmatic until Section 5.

4.1 For any field k let $L(k^n)$ be the (modular) subspace lattice of k^n. A *k-linear representation* of L is any homomorphism $\Phi : L \to L(k^n)$. Article [HW] classifies up to isomorphism[9] all k-linear representations of certain 'acyclic' modular lattices. For general modular lattices it is however nontrivial establishing the mere *existence* of injective, let alone tight k-linear representations, which is all we care about in the present article. Crucial in this regard is the following concept. A lattice L is called *2-distributive* if

$$(15) \qquad a \wedge (b \vee c \vee d) = (a \wedge (b \vee c)) \vee (a \wedge (b \vee d)) \vee (a \wedge (c \vee d))$$

for all $a, b, c, d \in L$. When L is modular, which is always the case for us, the dual identity holds as well. Evidently (15) is a (wide-ranging) generalization of the distributive law. It is an exercise to show that $L(GF(2)^3)$ violates (15). In fact, one can prove that L is 2-distributive iff it doesn't contain a length 3 interval that is isomorphic to $L(GF(2)^3)$. From this it readily follows that every modular L tightly embeddable into a partition lattice is necessarily 2-distributive.

4.2 The Lemma below is Lemma 5 in [W3] and handles the tight embeddability of modular lattices into $L(K,\widetilde{\ })$, the lattice of flats (=closed subsets) of a matroid $(K,\widetilde{\ })$ with universe K and closure operator $\mathcal{P}(K) \to \mathcal{P}(K) : \ X \mapsto \widetilde{X}$. Such flat lattices are also called *geometric* lattices. We denote by $J(L)$ the set of (nonzero) join-irreducibles of L. For each $a \in L$ we define $J(a) := \{p \in J(L) : \ p \leq a\}$.

Lemma 6: Let L be a modular lattice with $J = J(L)$, and let$(K,\widetilde{\ })$ be a matroid. There is a tight homomorphism $\Phi : L \to L(K,\widetilde{\ })$ iff the following holds. There is an injection $\varphi : J \to K$ such that the induced submatroid $(\varphi(J), -)$ is simple and such that (16) and (17) hold:

$$(16) \qquad \overline{\varphi(J(a))} = \varphi(J(a)) \text{ for all } a \in J.$$

$$(17) \qquad mrk(\varphi(J)) = d(L) \text{ (\textit{rank consistency of the second kind})}$$

4.2.1 In Lemma 6, how does Φ arise from φ, and vice versa? Given φ with (16) and (17), one can put $\Phi(a) := \widetilde{\varphi(J(a))}$. Conversely, given any tight homomorphism Φ, for each $p \in J$ pick any $p' \in \Phi(p) \setminus \Phi(p_*)$ and define $\varphi : J \to K$ by $\varphi(p) := p'$. Here p_* is the unique lower cover of p in L. It is crucial to distinguish the closure operator $\widetilde{\ }$ from $-$. For instance $\overline{\varphi(J(a))} = \varphi(J(a))$ by (16) whereas generally $\widetilde{\varphi(J(a))} \neq \varphi(J(a))$!

4.2.2 In view of the above we introduce the following handy concept. Let L be a modular lattice and let $(E, -)$ be any simple matroid. A bijection $\varphi : J(L) \to E$ will be called a $J(L)$-*matroid* if (16) and (17) take place. (Viewing tight homomorphisms $L \to L(K,\widetilde{\ })$ as $J(L)$-matroids allows us in Section 5 to compare them with L-born (J, Λ)-matroids, both being maps of type $J \to E$.) Consider the three increasingly special cases of $J(L)$-matroids where $(E, -)$ is a linear dependency matroid (thus $E \subseteq k^m$ for some field k), or where particularly $k = GF(2)$, or where $(E, -)$ is graphic. We then speak of *k-linear*, *binary* and *graphic* $J(L)$-matroids respectively. In the graphic case we can and will assume that E is a spanning subset of the edge set of the complete graph $CG(m)$ on m vertices, and say the $J(L)$-matroid is *supported* by $CG(m)$.

4.2.3 Suppose $(K,\widetilde{\ })$ is the linear dependency matroid $(k^m,\widetilde{\ })$ over some field k. Let L be a

[9]The k-linear representations Φ and Φ' are *isomorphic* if there is a vector space isomorphism $f : k^n \to k^n$ such that $\Phi'(a) = f(\Phi(a))$ for all $a \in L$. More on acyclic lattices follows in Section 5.

modular lattice for which there is a tight homomorphism $\Phi : L \to L(k^m)$ (we adopt traditional notation rather than writing $L(k^m,\tilde{})$). Then necessarily $n := d(L) \leq m$ and upon replacing k^m by the n-dimensional subspace $\Phi(\top)$ we can assume that Φ is of type $L \to L(k^n)$. Thus considering Φ's as in Corollary 7 is more convenient without being restrictive:

Corollary 7: Suppose the modular lattice L has a k-linear $J(L)$-matroid $\varphi : J(L) \to k^n$ with $n = d(L)$. If $\langle ... \rangle$ denotes the linear span of vectors then $\Phi(a) := \langle \varphi(J(a)) \rangle$ $(a \in L)$ provides a tight k-linear representation $\Phi : L \to L(k^n)$. Conversely any such Φ derives from a k-linear $J(L)$-matroid φ.

4.2.4 Recall from the Introduction that $Part(m)$ is defined as the lattice of all set partitions of $\{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. For succinctness let $CG(m)$ have vertex set $V = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and edge set K. It is well known that the graphic matroid $(K,\tilde{})$ has rank $m-1$ and a flat lattice $L(K,\tilde{})$ isomorphic to $Part(m)$. For any edge set $B \subseteq K$ we define $comp(B)$ as the partition of V whose blocks are the vertex sets of the connected components of the subgraph (V, B) of $CG(m)$. Let now $\Phi : L \to Part(m)$ be any tight lattice homomorphism. Akin to 4.2.3, but more subtle, one can show that $n := d(L) < m$ and that Φ induces a tight homomorphism of type $L \to Part(n+1)$. It thus suffices to focus on the latter type in our second Corollary of Lemma 6:

Corollary 8: Let L be a modular lattice with $n = d(L)$. If φ is a $J(L)$-matroid supported by $CG(n+1)$ then $\Phi(a) := comp(\varphi(J(a))$ $(a \in L)$ provides a tight homomorphism $\Phi : L \to Part(n+1)$. Conversely, any such Φ arises in this way.

For instance, consider the lattice L_3 in Figure 17(a) which has $d(L_3) = 3$ and $J = J(L_3) = \{p, q, r, s\}$. It admits the graphic $J(L_3)$-matroid $\varphi_1 : J \to E_1$ defined by Figure 17(b) (where we identify t and $\varphi(t)$). For instance $\varphi_1(J(b)) = \{p, q\}$ is closed in $(E_1, -)$, as are all[10] sets of type $\varphi_1(J(a))$ $(a \in L_3)$. Hence (16) is satisfied, and so Corollary 8 guarantees that $\Phi_1(a) := comp(\varphi_1(J(a))$ yields a tight lattice homomorphism $\Phi_1 : L_3 \to Part(4)$. Using shorthand notation for partitions as in Section 1, let us spell it out:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1(\bot) &= (1, 2, 3, 4) \\
\Phi_1(p) &= (13, 2, 4) \\
\Phi_1(q) &= (1, 2, 34) \\
\Phi_1(b) &= (134, 2) \\
\Phi_1(r) &= (12, 34) \\
\Phi_1(s) &= (1, 234) \\
\Phi_1(\top) &= (1234)
\end{aligned}$$

For instance, Φ_1 being compatible with $\vee$ and $\wedge$ we have:

$$\Phi_1(p) \vee \Phi_1(r) = (13, 2, 4) \vee (12, 34) = (1234) = \Phi_1(\top) = \Phi_1(p \vee r)$$
$$\Phi_1(p) \wedge \Phi_1(r) = (13, 2, 4) \wedge (12, 34) = (1, 2, 3, 4) = \Phi_1(\bot) = \Phi_1(p \wedge r)$$

One verifies that the function $\varphi_2 : J \to E_2$ defined by Figure 17(c) is a $J(L_3)$-matroid as well, and whence yields another tight lattice homomorphism $\Phi_2 : L_3 \to Part(4)$. As we shall see in

[10] In contrast the set $\{p, r, s\}$ is *not* closed in $(E_1, -)$ because it contains (in fact: equals) a 'broken circuit'.

the next Section, $J(L)$-matroids of the second type are easier to come by and to handle. For instance the tight homomorphism defined by Figure 1(a) also arose in this way.

4.2.5 A variation of Lemma 6 shows [W3, Theorem 4] that even each *semi*modular lattice L is tightly embeddable in a geometric lattice $L(K,\widetilde{\ })$, but possibly not in a 'nice' one like $L(k^n)$ or $Part(n+1)$ above. Rather the matroid $(K,\widetilde{\ })$ is *taylor-made* to accomodate L, warts and all. The proof of [W3, Theorem 4] cuts short previous ones by Dilworth 1973 and Grätzer-Kiss 1986.

5 Entering modular lattices. Part 2: Bases of lines

How can one *construct* $J(L)$-matroids, i.e. maps satisfying (16), (17), and what has it got to do with partial linear spaces? The answer is that historically PLSes came first and *they* (in the shape of 'bases of lines' below) led to conditions (16) and (17). Nevertheless, for systematic reasons we reversed the time-arrow in the present article.

5.1 Let L be a modular lattice. If $\ell \subseteq J(L)$ is maximal w.r.t. the property that any distinct $p, q \in \ell$ yield the *same* join $p \vee q$ (which we denote by $\overline{\ell}$), and[11] if $|\ell| = 3$ then ℓ is called a *line of* L, or simply *line*. Two lines ℓ and ℓ_0 are *equivalent* if $\overline{\ell} = \overline{\ell_0}$. Any maximal family Λ of mutually inequivalent lines yields a partial linear space (J, Λ) (since (1) is satisfied), which we call a *base of lines* of L. For instance, take $L = L_1$ from Figure 1 which is rendered again (with labels) in Figure 19(a); thus $J(L_1) = \{1, \ldots, 9\}$. For instance $\ell = \{4, 6, 8\}$ is a line with $\overline{\ell} = \top$. The line $\ell_0 = \{5, 7, 8\}$ (and many others) is equivalent to ℓ. One verifies that the five lines in Figure 19(b) yield a base of lines $(J(L_2), \Lambda)$.

Problem 2: Which kinds of partial linear spaces occur as bases of lines of (specific) modular lattices?

5.2 An *order ideal* in a poset $(P, \leq)$ is a subset $X \subseteq P$ such that from $y \leq x \in X$ follows $y \in X$. The set $D(P, \leq)$ of all order ideals is closed under $\cap$ and $\cup$, whence it is a (necessarily distributive) sublattice of the powerset lattice $\mathcal{P}(P)$. For any lattice L consider the poset $(J, \leq)$ arising from restricting the lattice ordering to the subset $J = J(L)$. By Birkhoff's Theorem each distributive lattice D is isomorphic to $D(J, \leq)$ via $a \mapsto J(a)$.

5.3 Bases of lines are important because they extend Birkhoff's Theorem in elegant ways to modular lattices L. Specifically, fix any base of lines (J, Λ) of L. Then an order ideal X of $(J, \leq)$ is called Λ-*closed* if for all $\ell \in \Lambda$ it follows from $|\ell \cap X| \geq 2$ that $\ell \subseteq X$. If $L(J, \leq, \Lambda)$ denotes the closure system of all Λ-closed order ideals then $a \mapsto J(a)$ turns out [HW, Thm. 2.5] to be a lattice isomorphism from L onto $L(J, \leq, \Lambda)$. If $L = D$ is distributive then $\Lambda = \emptyset$, and so $L(J, \leq, \Lambda)$ boils down to $D(J, \leq)$ in 5.2.

5.3.1 It follows [W3, Lemma 19] from the 2-distributivity of a modular lattice L that for each base of lines (J, Λ) it holds that

[11] While $|\ell| > 3$ occurs we will be only be interested in lattices L all of whose lines have cardinality 3. Recall the corresponding remark about PLSes.

(18) $rk(J,\Lambda) = d(L)$.

For instance $L_0,\ L_1$ from Figures 18 and 19 are 2-distributive and one checks that $rk(J_i,\Lambda_i) = d(L_i) = 4$ $(i = 1, 2)$. As stated in Section 4, if $k = GF(2)$ then $L_2 = L(k^3)$ is not 2-distributive. That's why in (3) we found that the unique base of lines (J_2,Λ_2) of L_2 had $rk(J_2,\Lambda_2) = 0 \neq d(L_2)$. A modular lattice is *acyclic* if all (equivalently: one) its bases of lines are acyclic as PLSes. Each acyclic modular lattice is 2-distributive, but not conversely. For instance L_3 in Fig.17 is acyclic but $L_0,\ L_1$ are not.

5.3.2 The $s = s(L)$ subdirectly irreducible factors M_i of a modular lattice M bijectively match[12] the connected components of (J,Λ). One can show [HW, Thm.6.4] that always $|J(M)| \geq 2d(M) - s(M)$, and that '=' takes place iff M is acyclic. For instance for $M = L_3$ in Fig. 17 this becomes $4 = 2\cdot 3 - 2$. In the distributive case we have $|J(M)| = d(M) = s(M)$ and all connected components of $(J,\Lambda) = (J,\emptyset)$ are singletons. Similar to [W3, Cor.8] one shows that the tight embeddability of lattices M_i into partition lattices is inherited by any subdirect product M of the M_i's. In particular, each distributive lattice (being a subdirect product of 2-element chains) is tightly embeddable into a partition lattice. By the same reason, apart from the variety of distributive lattices, many other locally finite varieties $\mathcal{V}$ of modular lattices have the property that all finite members M of $\mathcal{V}$ are tightly embeddable into a partition lattice.

5.4 We can now begin to understand the relation between the (J,Λ)-matroids in Section 3 and the $J(L)$-matroids in Section 4.

Let us start with a (J,Λ)-matroid $\psi : J \to E$, i.e. ψ satisfies (6) and (8). If (J,Λ) is L-born in the sense of 2.6, i.e. J happens to be $J = J(L)$ for some modular lattice L, does it follow that ψ is a $J(L)$-matroid, i.e. that (16) and (17) are satisfied? As to (17), this indeed holds in view of (8) and (18). As to the truth of (16), this is more subtle, and will occupy us in Subsection 5.5.

Vice versa, start with a $J(L)$-matroid $\varphi : J \to E$, i.e. φ satisfies (16) and (17). Is there a suitable base of lines (J,Λ) such that φ is a (J,Λ)-matroid, i.e. satisfying (6) and (8)? As to (8), akin to above this follows from (17) and (18). But (6) is false; there are $J(L)$-matroids, such as φ_1 in 4.2.4, that are not (J,Λ)-matroids, whatever base of lines is chosen.

In a nutshell, so far the state of affairs is as follows. First, rank consistency carries over in both directions. Second, the fact that $J(L)$-matroids generally are not (J,Λ)-matroids is irrelevant for us since (for the time being) we cannot help but coming from the (J,Λ)-matroid side. Third, whether conversely a (J,Λ)-matroid induces (under friendly circumstances) a $J(L)$-matroid, will be dealt with in 5.5 and 5.6.

5.5 So, taking any L-born (J,Λ)-matroid $\psi : J \to E$ we wish to find out when the closedness condition (16) takes place. In 5.5 we focus on *graphic* (J,Λ)-matroids. Then, according to [W3, Lemma 10] condition (16) holds if and only if:

(19) For each chordless cycle $\psi(X) \subseteq E$ of G it holds that $q \leq \bigvee(X \setminus \{q\})$ for all $q \in X$.

[12] More precisely, the congruence lattice $Con(M)$ is Boolean of length s. Its co-atoms $\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_s$ hence satisfy $\theta_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge \theta_s = \Delta$, where $\Delta = \{(x,x) :\ x \in M\}$ is the identity-congruence. Putting $M_i := M/\theta_i$ it follows that $a \mapsto (a\theta_1,\ldots,a\theta_s)$ is an injective lattice homomorphism from M into $M_1 \times \ldots \times M_s$.

Suppose L has a UMP base of lines (J, Λ), i.e. with unique midpoints, such as in Fig. 18. Then Lemma 2 guarantees a graphic (J, Λ)-matroid $\psi : J \to E$. In this scenario (19) holds and, specifically, by Lemma 14 in [W3] the following takes place.

Case 1: If (J, Λ) is even acyclic then each chordless cycle $\psi(X)$ of G comes from $X = \ell$ for some $\ell \in \Lambda$. Then (19) is clearly satisfied: If say $\ell = \{p, q, r\}$ then $p \vee q = p \vee r = q \vee r = \overline{\ell}$ by definition of a line, whence $q \leq p \vee r$ and $p \leq q \vee r$ and $r \leq p \vee q$.

Case 2: If (J, Λ) is merely UMP then a chordless cycle $\psi(X)$ of G can also arise (apart from $X = \ell$) from the set X of midpoints of a cycle of (J, Λ). The very technical proof of [W3, Lemma 20] shows that such an X also satisfies (19).

The above in conjunction with Corollary 8 yields:

Corollary 9: If the height n modular lattice L has an UMP base of lines then there is a tight homomorphism $\Phi : L \to Part(n + 1)$.

Like every acyclic lattice $L = L_3$ in Figure 17(a) has an UMP base of lines, which in this case is unique. The tight homomorphism guaranteed in Corollary 9 comes from φ_2 in Fig.17(c). In contrast $J(L)$-matroids such as φ_1, which aren't (J, Λ)-matroids, currently don't fit our framework.

5.6 Is there a way to generalize away from UMP bases of lines in Corollary 9? Yes there is, but the price is to generalize away from graphs to *binary* matroids. Then, provided L is 2-distributive, *each* base of lines (J, Λ) of L allows a binary (J, Λ)-matroid that induces a tight homomorphism $\Phi : L \to L(GF(2)^n$ (Theorem 11 below).

For starters, it is handy to call a L-born (J, Λ)-matroid *exquisite* if it happens to be a $J(L)$-matroid. For each fixed base of lines (J, Λ) there is at most one exquisite binary (J, Λ)-matroid:

Theorem 10: Let L be a modular lattice that has a base of lines (J, Λ) that allows several exquisite binary (J, Λ)-matroids φ_i. Then the binary representations Φ_i of L induced by these φ_i's are mutually isomorphic.

Proof. Let $\varphi_i : J \to E$ be exquisite (J, Λ)-matroids $(i = 1, 2)$. Put $k = GF(2)$. Thus $E \subseteq k^n$ has matroid-rank $n = d(L)$. Let $\varphi_1(\alpha),\ \varphi_1(\beta), \ldots$ constitute a base of k^n . To fix ideas, suppose that L has (J, Λ) as in Figure 20. Then $n = 4$ and $\varphi_1(\alpha),\ \varphi_1(\beta),\ \varphi_1(\gamma),\ \varphi_1(\delta)$ form a base.

Because $\varphi_1(\alpha),\ \varphi_1(v), \varphi_1(\beta)$ are dependent by (6), the fact[13] that $k = \{0, 1\}$ forces $\varphi_1(v) = \varphi_1(\alpha) + \varphi_1(\beta)$. Similarly one concludes:

$$(20)\ \ \varphi_1(w) = \varphi_1(\beta) + \varphi_1(\gamma),\ \varphi_1(x) = \varphi_1(\gamma) + \varphi_1(\delta),\ \ \varphi_1(y) = \varphi_1(\alpha) + \varphi_1(\delta),$$
$$\varphi_1(z) = \varphi_1(y) + \varphi_1(w) = \varphi_1(\alpha) + \varphi_1(\delta) + \varphi_1(\beta) + \varphi_1(\gamma) = \varphi_1(v) + \varphi_1(x)$$

[13]The example in [W1,p.45] shows that Theorem 10 fails for all *larger* fields, even for small lattices like L_0 from Figure 18.



Fig. 18





Fig. 19 (a)



Fig 19 (b)



Fig. 19 (c)



Fig. 20

By the same token $\varphi_2(v) = \varphi_2(\alpha) + \varphi_2(\beta)$, and generally all $\varphi_2(p)$ are linear combinations of $\varphi_2(\alpha), \ldots, \varphi_2(\delta)$, which is a base of k^4 as well. Define the vector space isomorphism $f : k^4 \to k^4$ by $f(\varphi_1(\alpha)) := \varphi_2(\alpha), \ldots, f(\varphi_1(\delta)) := \varphi_2(\delta)$ By linearity we e.g. have

$$f(\varphi_1(v)) = f(\varphi_1(a) + \varphi_1(b)) = \varphi_2(a) + \varphi_2(b) = \varphi_2(v)$$

and generally $f(\varphi_1(p)) = \varphi_2(p)$ for all $p \in J$. Keeping in mind how Φ_i arises from φ_i (Corollary 7) it follows that

$$f(\Phi_1(a)) = f(\ \langle \varphi_1(p) :\ p \in J,\ p \leq a \rangle\ )\ =\ \langle \varphi_2(p) :\ p \in J,\ p \leq a \rangle = \Phi_2(a)$$

for all $a \in L$. Hence f is an isomorphism from Φ_1 to Φ_2. QED

So much about uniqueness, but what about existence?

Theorem 11 ([W2, Thm.16] which improves [HW, Thm.5.1]): Each base of lines (J, Λ) of each 2-distributive modular lattice L admits an exquisite binary (J, Λ)-matroid.

Although general 2-distributive modular lattices are not acyclic, it's their *local* acyclicity that makes the proof of Theorem 11 tick. In a nutshell, when restricting (say) the base of lines in Fig.19(b) to any covering quotient, such as $(y, \top)$ in Fig.19(a), then the points in $J(\top) \setminus J(y)$ induce an acyclic PLS as in Fig.19(c). One can then construct Φ (in parallel with φ) by induction on the length of L, i.e. without worrying about (16). This construction also shows, touching upon Problem 2, that for a 2-distributive modular lattice each base of lines is nondrowning constructible.

In view of Theorem 10 and 11 we can speak of *the* exquisite binary (J, Λ)-matroid ψ_Λ induced by any base of lines (J, Λ) of a 2-distributive modular lattice L. Notice that exquisite binary (J, Λ)-matroids belonging to *distinct* bases of lines of L may well induce isomorphic tight representations of L. Actually, when L is acyclic, this always happens.

6 The way ahead

Theorem 1 of Mighton [M] gives a condition[14] for a binary matroid M to be graphic. This condition is easier to verify than previous characterizations of graphicness. Perhaps it can conveniently be verified for M's which are only *partially* known. For instance, suppose the following was true:

(21) For any PLS (J, Λ) with condition X each binary (J, Λ)-matroid $\psi : J \to E$ satisfies the Mighton condition, and whence $(E, -)$ is graphic.

Let L be a 2-distributive modular lattice with a base of lines (J, Λ) that fulfills condition X (whatever that may be). By (21) in particular the exquisite (J, Λ)-matroid $\varphi := \psi_\Lambda$ must be such that $(\varphi(J), -)$ is graphic. By Corollary 8 there is a tight homomorphism $L \to Part(n+1)$.

[14] It involves the cocircuits of M with respect to any fixed basis and certain "'avoidance graphs"' whose bipartiteness needs to be verified.

Problem 3: Which conditions X make (21) a true statement?

For instance, is (21) true when X is the condition of being an UMP-PLS? If yes then we would have an elegant proof of the fact (Corollary 9) that each height n modular lattice with a UMP base of lines is tightly embeddable into $Part(n+1)$.

Let us state three more problems whose solution would considerably advance the state of the art. For starters, does the following kind of converse of Theorem 4 hold?

Problem 4: Let (J, Λ) be a PLS that loves short midpoint-links. Does this imply the existence of a wheely (J, Λ)-matroid?

If the answer is yes, it still remains to ensure, in the L-born case, that the wheely (J, Λ)-matroid satisfies (16) (i.e. is $J(L)$-matroid), which in turn amounts to (19). Rather than tackling (19) as in the UMP case (see 5.5), it is probably more effective proceeding inductively (akin to the remarks following Theorem 11) . Turning from Theorem 4 to Corollary 5, consider

Problem 5: If *no* base of lines (J, Λ) of L loves short midpoint-links, does it follow that L is *not* tightly embeddable into a partition lattice?

Recall from Corollary 5 that the length 4 lattice L_1 in Figure 1 is such that its base of lines (J_1, Λ_1) in Figure 3, and all its other bases of lines do not love short midpoint-links. And indeed, it follows from [W3, Thm.6] that L_1 is not tightly embeddable into $Part(5)$. An optimistic attitude towards the solvability of Problems 4 and 5 leads to this

Conjecture: A 2-distributive modular lattice L is tightly embeddable into a partition lattice iff it has a base of lines that loves short midpoint-links.

In another vein, here is one more problem.

Problem 6: Can the machinery developped in this article be adapted to handle *non-tight* but injective embeddings of modular lattices L into moderate-size partition lattices $Part(V)$?

In this regard recall the remarks in Section 1 about the super-exponentiality occuring in the Pudlak-Tuma Theorem.

References

[HW] C. Herrmann, M. Wild, Acyclic modular lattices and their representations, J. Algebra 136 (1991) 17-36.

[M] J. Mighton, A new characterization of graphic matroids, J. Comb. Theory B 98 (2008) 1253-1258.

[W1] M. Wild, Dreieckverbände: Lineare und quadratische Darstellungstheorie, PHD 1987, University of Zurich.

[W2] M. Wild, Modular lattices of finite length, 28 pages, unpublished, 1992. (An overdue revision of these ancient notes is under way.)

[W3] M. Wild, Cover preserving embedding of modular lattices into partition lattices, Discrete Mathematics 112 (1993) 207-244.

[W4] M. Wild, An invitation for combinatorists with a taste for graphic matroids, 6 pages, unpublished, 2013.